

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### COMMUNICATIONS STANDARDS COMMISSION MINORITY REPORT AND LETTER

#### HON. KAT CAMMACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 30, 2021

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, on May 24, 2021, the Chair of the House Communications Standards Commission conducted Poll 117-1: Based on the Complaint submitted to the Commission on April 22, 2021, by Representative EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER against Representative ZOE LOFGREN and Representative LOFGREN's Answer to the Complaint, submitted to the Commission on May 6, 2021, this Commission was asked to decide if a violation of the House of Representatives Communications Standards Manual occurred.

Poll 117-1 was conducted prematurely per the Commission rules of procedures, absent of proper investigation, and therefore invalid. The Republican Members were unable to offer a vote to a poll that was invalid.

MAY 24, 2021.

Hon. MARY GAY SCANLON,  
*Chairwoman, Communication Standards Commission, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

CHAIRWOMAN SCANLON: On May 21, you sent a poll regarding the Communication Standards violation complaint brought against Representative Zoe Lofgren ("Complaint") to the Members of the Communications Standards Commission for consideration. As you have conceded, this poll is invalid because it is procedurally unripe and violates Commission Rules.

Commission Rules are quite clear. Upon receipt of a valid complaint, the Commission has thirty days to adjudicate the complaint and issue its written decision. Rule 9. The Commission's adjudication process begins with Rule 6, which requires the Commission's Chair and Ranking Member to "review the respondent's answer to the complaint" in order to agree to dismiss the complaint or jointly or independently conclude that the complaint "presents a reasonable justification to warrant further review". Following a "decision by either the Chair and/or the Ranking Member that further review of the complaint is warranted to determine if a violation has occurred, the respondent shall be given notice of further review." Rule 7 (emphases added). Following "further review", the Commission may "determine[] there is substantial reason to believe that a violation has occurred", which may lead to a hearing. Rule 8. Following a vote on "substantial reason to believe" and/or a hearing, a majority of the Commission may decide to dismiss the complaint (Rule 10), or the Chair and Ranking Member may determine a violation has occurred. Rule 11. Only if the Complaint is not dismissed and the Chair and Ranking Member are unable to reach a determination, shall the full Commission vote on such a determination. Rule 13.

The complaint was received by the Commission on April 22, and your first availability to meet with Ranking Member Cammack to discuss the complaint was on May 19. This Rule 6 meeting on May 19 was

an opportunity to determine if a reasonable justification for further review of the complaint was warranted. Rule 6. At the conclusion of the meeting and at your request, the final Rule 6 determination was delayed in order to permit further reflection. This delay now appears to have been a tactic to avoid fulfilling the Commission's responsibility to protect federal taxpayer dollars.

Disappointingly, you sent this poll on May 21, three days before the May 24th statutory deadline for the Commission to issue its written decision. The Commission did not need to be in this position, with no time to complete its work.

Your poll instructs the full Membership of the Commission to determine whether the alleged violations occurred. Setting aside the fact that the Commission has engaged in no investigation of the Complaint, this poll is clearly procedurally invalid and in contravention of Commission Rules, as you agree. You cite Rule 13 as your authority to put this question before the entire Commission, yet no action under Rule 13 is ripe. As explained above, and as you now appear to agree, procedure here is quite clear. The full Commission may vote on dismissal only once either the Chair or Ranking Member concludes under Rule 6 that "the complaint presents a reasonable justification to warrant further review" (Rule 6), the Commission notifies the respondent of such further review (Rule 7), and the Commission considers whether "there is substantial reason to believe that a violation has occurred[.]" Rule 8. Pursuant to your suggestion for delay, neither the Chair nor the Ranking Member had issued a Rule 6 conclusion when you issued the Rule 13 poll on May 21. Further, the full Commission may vote on final determination (Rule 13) only if the Commission does not dismiss the complaint under Rule 8 and the Chair and Ranking Member are unable to reach a "determin[ation]" that a violation has occurred[.]" Rule 11. On May 24, you agreed to send the notice of further review required by Rule 7 to Representative Lofgren. Last Congress, Democrats and Republicans agreed in a bipartisan manner to update and revise our procedural rules. Let us now conduct ourselves according to these bipartisan rules and execute our responsibilities as required.

After it became apparent that your requested delay at the Rule 6 meeting was merely a delay tactic, Ranking Member Cammack informed you of her timely conclusion that the Complaint presents a reasonable justification to warrant further review. Under pressure on this issue, you agreed to notify Representative Lofgren that the Commission will review further the Complaint, as required by Rule 7, conceding that this poll is procedurally invalid and in contravention of Commission Rules. Given the serious nature of the violations outlined in the Complaint and the now-short timeframe for the Commission to complete its work, Ranking Member Cammack also suggested an extension of 30 days for the Commission to issue its written decision. It is imperative that the Commission have sufficient time to review the Complaint, and if necessary, to request additional information before the Chair and Ranking Member or the Commission make a determination with respect to the alleged violations.

Further, and despite its now-admitted, fatal procedural defect, your poll requests

that the Commission determine without any investigation whether the alleged violations occurred. Because of your various dilatory tactics that led us to this point, there is now no way for the Commission to complete its work without an extension. There is not even enough time for the Commission to request additional information from the complainant or respondent to inform its work. See Rule 7. Today is the last day for the Commission to issue a written decision, affording the parties no opportunity to respond. There is simply not enough time for the Commission to determine thoughtfully whether the alleged violations occurred.

Since the Commission's inception in 1974, this bipartisan Commission has historically conducted a fair and bipartisan review of all valid complaints received. It is our hope that this tradition will continue this Congress. As such, the full Commission must be afforded the ability to perform its statutory responsibility to review this valid complaint and, at the appropriate time, to vote on its disposition. As Ranking Member Cammack has suggested, an extension of time for the Commission to complete its review of the Complaint is necessary and appropriate.

As you have conceded, the distributed poll is procedurally unripe and violates Commission Rules. Therefore, we decline to vote on this invalid poll and encourage the Chair to permit the Commission to complete its work in accordance with Commission Rules. We stand ready to work with you through this process.

Sincerely,

KAT CAMMACK,  
*Ranking Member,*  
*Communications Standards Commission.*  
BRYAN STEIL,  
*Member,*  
*Communications Standards Commission.*  
BOB LATTA,  
*Member,*  
*Communications Standards Commission.*

### CELEBRATING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR LADY OF PEACE HOSPICE & HOME HEALTH CARE

#### HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 30, 2021

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the staff, volunteers, patients, and families of Our Lady of Peace Home on its 80th anniversary of service to the Saint Paul community. A non-profit community hospice and home health care organization offering care at no cost to those in need, Our Lady of Peace has been a beacon of light caring for more than 25,000 people at the end-of-life and their families over the past eight decades.

The Our Lady of Peace legacy in Saint Paul began in 1941 when nine nuns from the Dominican Sisters of Hawthorne traveled to Minnesota from New York to open the Our Lady of Good Counsel Home. This was the sixth home established by the nuns, and their focus then was on serving terminally ill cancer patients without means to pay or care for themselves. This service was started by Rose

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Hawthorne Lathrop who nursed cancer patients in New York City in the late 1800s before founding the Dominican Sisters of Hawthorne. The hospice home in Saint Paul was the furthest west out of all six homes and took shape during a globally perilous time in history as World War II was waging in Europe. Nevertheless, the grand opening for Our Lady of Good Counsel's home in Saint Paul was set, and they opened their doors on December 7, 1941—a day that would live in infamy for the attack on Pearl Harbor that would launch the United States into the war.

From that day onward, the sisters and other volunteers at the home have provided compassionate care for terminally ill patients while bringing comfort and support to their loved ones. Though the modern practice of hospice care was not introduced until the late 1960's, the Dominican Sisters of Hawthorne had been quietly providing hospice care for decades. Throughout those first few decades of service, Our Lady of Good Counsel depended entirely on donations of goods, money, time, and service, and they never accepted payment from patients, families, insurance companies or the government. Today they still rely heavily on volunteers and donations to cover any costs not covered by Medicare payments in order to ensure a free service to patients and families. In 1980 they were able to replace the old Tri-State Telephone Company building in which they were founded with a brand-new building. The new building included a chapel, central courtyard with gardens and a fountain, and two floors for patient rooms; expanding their capacity to the twenty-one beds that remain today.

The turn of the century marked a period of expansion and transition for the organization. In the early 2000's they introduced an official hospice program which allowed them to provide end-of-life care outside of their residential facility and serve people in their homes throughout the entire 7-county metro area in Minnesota. They also established the Home Health Care program which provides in-home help with daily living, post-operative care and other therapies. They are also affiliated with the Highland Block Nurse Program which is funded in part by Title III of the Older Americans Act and provides a variety of services for older adults and their caregivers in the Highland Park neighborhood in St. Paul. In 2009 the operation of the home was transitioned to the St. Paul-based Franciscan Health Community, and two years later the home was officially renamed "Our Lady of Peace."

Led by President & CEO Joe Stanislav, Our Lady of Peace is served today by four Franciscan Clarist nuns and employs over 130 workers including chaplains, social workers, nurses and a full-time physician. And despite their ties to the church as a Catholic non-profit organization they serve patients from all religious or non-religious backgrounds and walks of life. For 80 years they have upheld their mission to gently comfort and care for those most in need near the end of their lives, wherever they call home, regardless of means. Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Our Lady of Peace's benevolent and dedicated staff and volunteers—as well as the patients and families they serve—on their 80th anniversary of service.

## RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT AWARD RECIPIENTS

### HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 30, 2021*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the phenomenal young men and women in my district who attained the rank of Eagle Scout in 2021. Our community is proud of their achievement and grateful for their commitment to service.

Aaron Michael, Troop 153; Adam L. Cameron, Troop 79; A. J. Hirsch, Troop 10; Alex Borzillo, Troop 137; Alex Freeman, Troop 145; Alex Wood, Troop 6; Andrew Dreyzin, Troop 6; Aryan Patil, Troop 137; Benjamin Gromer, Troop 30; Benjamin Parks Stanell, Troop 34; Bennett Drakas, Troop 172; Bennett Smith, Troop 10; Bobby Evans, Troop 71; Brendan Bolte, Troop 547; Bryce Pannone, Troop 102. Caleb Reese Gilbert, Troop 461; Cameron Walsh, Troop 229; Chris Strickland, Troop 6; Christian Gary van der Kleut, Troop 461; Christian Kruse, Troop 34; Christopher Richard Hogan, Troop 10; C.J. Frisbie, Troop 6; Collin McGuire, Troop 229; Connor Blaise Harkiewicz, Troop 10; Connor V. Wilson, Troop 61; Dalton Bell, Troop 133; Dan Goldberg, Troop 137; Daniel Allan Kitchen, Troop 11; David Slavtcheff, Troop 99; Dean Richard DiDomenico, Troop 147.

Derek Lee Graver, Troop 16; Erik Ulmer, Troop 187; Ethan J. Ford, Troop 547; Ethan Wight, Troop 36; Evan Gerdy, Troop 30; Greg Kraynak, Troop 229; Gregory Andrew Sanborn, Troop 113; Hope Evanko, Troop 99G; Jack Flaherty, Troop 24; Jack Mannarino, Troop 10; Jack Reed, Troop 51; Jack Weldon, Troop 6; Jackson Rugarber, Troop 11; Jacob Rea, Troop 10; Jacob Webb, Troop 456.

James Sholly, Jr., Troop 137; Jared Daniel, Troop 36; Jason Hemminger, Troop 27; Jayden Morris, Troop 48; Jesse Caimi, Troop 137; Jesse Hirowski, Troop 137; Jodi Decker, Troop 30G; John Hutchins, Troop 10; John P. Daley, Troop 16; John Saveriano, Troop 67; Joseph Benincasa, Troop 145; Joseph Cook, Troop 153; Joseph P. Deitzel, Troop 547; Joshua Rowlands, Troop 145; Justin Kruse, Troop 34.

Kamren DeJesus, Troop 102; Larson Hunt, Troop 316; Logan McHenry, Troop 51; Marcus Milkowich, Troop 87; Matthew Aber, Troop 16; Matthew Grindle, Troop 67; Matthew Hanly, Troop 34; Matthew Miok, Troop 36; Michael Krajci, Troop 10; Michael Scott Lorenz, Troop 461; Michael Socci, Troop 6; Nathan Trilling, Troop 870; Nicholas Philipps, Troop 27; Nick Fuchs, Troop 229; Owen Webster, Troop 36.

Pawan Chivukula, Troop 10; Preston Ziegenfuss, Troop 14; Quinn Keller, Troop 67; Reed Stoltz, Troop 147; Robert M. Blum, Troop 10; Roman Berretta, Troop 36; Ryan Killenbeck, Troop 137; Ryan Swope, Troop 145; Sam Dessino, Troop 137; Sarah Elizabeth Hogan, Troop 99G; Sean M. Gutekunst, Troop 82; Stephen Nothum, Troop 24; Thomas Clifford Warren, Troop 64; Tim Goldberg, Troop 137; Timothy Grindle, Troop 167.

Tristin Kilgore, Troop 99; Tyler Kennedy, Troop 6; Tyler Rugarber, Troop 10; Will Cusick, Troop 10; William Callum, Troop 36; William Holzel, Troop 141; William Isaac Leyland, Troop 461; Zachary Charles Lincoln, Troop 1.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 30, 2021*

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I was present and intended to vote "YEA" on Roll Call No. 449 on final passage of S.J. Res 33. However, it has come to my attention that my vote was not recorded, and I would like to state that my vote would have been YEA on Roll Call No. 449 on final passage of S.J. Res 33.

## REMEMBERING LEWIS EARL POWELL, JR.

### HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 30, 2021*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, my deepest sympathies go out to the family of Lewis Earl Powell, Jr. He was someone that was cherished by his family and community. His wife, Millie Powell, has been a valued member of the Congressional staff of the Second District and this is a loss for us all.

## OBITUARY OF LEWIS EARL POWELL, JR.

Lewis Earl Powell Jr., 78, of Cayce, left his earthly home surrounded by his loving family, on Wednesday, December 22, 2021. He was born October 9, 1943, in Johnston, SC to the late Cora Harris Powell and Lewis Earl Powell, Sr.

Lewis was a loving husband, father, and grandfather. He was employed with 3M National Advertising for many years and later the owner and operator of Powell Sign Company, Inc. His kindness, generosity, and humor were known by all who knew him.

He is survived by his wife of 41 years Mildred "Millie" Powell; his children: Teresa Rinder (Johnny), Dawn Kimura, Kristian Hall (Michael), and Scott Dorsey (Victoria); grandchildren: Joshua Rinder (Elizabeth), Jeremy Rinder (Whitney), Amber McCormick (Rhett), Corali Kimura, Amelia Kimura, Brandon Dorsey, and Brianna Dorsey; four great-grandchildren; his sister, Sandra Holmes; his brother, Laverne (Carolyn) Powell; and a beloved sister-in-law, Wanda Gunter. He was predeceased by his brother, Jimmy Powell; and his sister, Sara Bryan.

A private graveside service will be held at Celestial Memorial Gardens. In lieu of flowers, donations may be made to Prisma Health Hospice.

The family wishes to thank the staff at Prisma Health Hospice and extend our deepest gratitude to Dr. Karin Jenkins and nurse Freia W. for their compassionate care.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF MÓNICA CRIADO-CUEVAS

### HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 30, 2021*

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mónica Criado-Cuevas. Mónica passed away on December 13, 2021. She was an inspiring woman, mother, mentor, wife, and cultural figure.